Reserve

App F IX 4

192

File No. 205-25

Previous References

Serial Nos. 1 – 5

Last Date
June 11

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Series No.

Part B for

SUBJECT

Mona Square

Mustafa

Tank

G. R. S. APP'F.III—1] 1928.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES. File No. 21

FILE HEADING.

Management of Sri Tirumala Devaru temple at Reddikatti Chaunarayapatna Taluk Hassan Dist.

FROM

Patel Venkate Gowda of Reddikatti

~~No.~~ Petition Dated 3-12-1928 Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No.
831			

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Appeals against the M. C's order confirming the D. C's order appointing Dharmadarsis and making other satisfactory arrangements for the better management of the insm, and prays for a stay order pending disposal of the appeal by Govt

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The petition is duly stamped. An authenticated copy of the M. C's order appealed against has been produced The M. C's order is dated 9/10/28, while the appeal petition was received on 3-12-28 It is in time

NOTES—First Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mur — File No 205 of 1927

Serial No.

The M. C's order explains the facts of the case. The M C has sanctioned a Scheme of management for the better conduct of worship in the inam, The lease for 5 years of 10 acres of land Granted to it & the appointment of Dharmakartha &c.

The apltts case is that Sri Trimala Devasam temple by itself is a muz inam endowed with inam lands & that abt the year 1878, his ancestor renovated the temple at great cost, endowed it with jewels etc and set their family Deities — Sri Venkateswara Swamy & Sri Devi and Bhoo Devi — He requests that he may be continued free in the management of the inam, otherwise the management of his family Deities be restored to him together with 10 acres of Kaudayam land since Granted by Govt which have been ordered to be leased out. May a report with records be called for in the appeal petition Orders solicited on the apltts prayer for a Stay and a Submit for orders-

5/1 for Mundy 28/6/12

6
Records to be called for and Case heard
No stay order
Mur
6.12.28

DEC. 1928
3466

NOTE – Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mem File No 200 of 192

Serial No.

Inst Dispatch Section.
7/12/27

7/12

2 To Mem Com^r
No 1167 dy. 14.12.28.
forwards the above & calls perm Vol Records & states that this petn was referred that no stay order could be passed

3 Govt No 1158 dy 14.12.28. to the petr informing him the above

4. From, the Dy. C. Collector No 1010 dy 11. 2. 1929.
Submits the records connected with the case.
Subs

The appellant Venkatagowda, in his appeal petition has raised the following points for consideration:—
(1) Sri Somnadeswara temple, in Nedhalli is a small muzrai institution with a small inam of 2 acres of land.
(2) About 1876 his father and grand father renovated this dilapidated building, on the permission of the Dk authorities, and installed their family deities:— Sri Venkateswara Swami & Sri Devi & Bhoodevi

NOTE – Contn. sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 2 of 192

Serial No.

P.C

3. The P. ganc was in enjoyment of the grant lands, but the appellants' family had the management of the Trust.

4. To facilitate daily worship he obtained 10 acres of land for the Temple in 1927.

5. owing to factions feeling on representations by the villagers, Dharmakarans were appointed & the new land was leased out for cult. — and his control removed.

As he failed to get his claims recognized in the lower Courts he has brought this appeal. His prayers are: (1) the revision of the orders re the management by abolishing the Dharmakarans and appointing him the Sole administrator of the Temple or (2) permit him to manage his family affairs & to erect a separate house for the Ayan Pite to be granted to him, with an Separate grant of 20 acres of land for its upkeep

(1) The Divisional Officer has a small inam ops fd land S no 13 - 0 30 bagt 1-34 -- dry } and this is said to be in the possession of the Archak.

(2) The mathirgaan dated 15-1-1927

I

A

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-29

Serial No.

Supports his contention that this temple was renovated by his father Thimmegowda who installed the family Gods, which fact is now contested by some villagers who say they also contributed towards the cost of repairs etc.

The copies of H. Govt orders produced before the amildar, only shows that permission was granted for repairing the temple; no documents to prove his allegations, that Gowda Promised sole management in his family & appear to have been produced in any of the lower Courts —

after full enquiry the Dy. Com^r has appointed Dharmadarsis for this temple on a request made by the villagers and ordered hearing of the new grant. Mayavalli Comm^r has declined to cancell his order of the Dy. C^r. though nothing that the income of this institution is very little.

The last request of the appellant in the alternative, is that the right of Puja of his family deities installed in the same temple must be separated and bestowed on him & Separate grant of Site and additional lands for its upkeep shd be given. He prays a hearing. & inspection of documents in his possession.

WW. Notice to appellant & Govt.

1/2

NOTE – Contn. sheet

Serial No.

The Member has already directed that the case may be heard. Mr ~~Mr~~ ~~Mr~~ after calling for the records. There is no reason to leave management of such a simple man who has not established his clear ~~title~~ rights to the management. The appointment of Dharmakartas & leasing of lands are beneficial to the temple. The Muzrai says that the decision of the lower court can be considered after the present leave vacations

The case will be posted for hearing after vacation

for Member 15/2

A. Mos 16-2-28 15/2

D/d. notices submitted

AC 26/3 Reg.

13/3

Ex. Ad 4958

NOTE—Contn. sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 200 of 1923.

Serial No.

5888/26/3.

The case was heard on 26th March 1929.

The Appellant was present and was represented by his Counsel Mr. V.N.Srinivasan: some of the villagers of the Reddinalli village were also present and presented a petition.

O r d e r.

There are no reasons to interfere with the orders passed by the Muzrai Commissioner and the appeal is therefore rejected.

26 3 29

Mr. Aiyer Subramanian
AV
2.4.29.

W
2/4

5 To - The Inam Commr
No 2165-D/6-4-29.
I do a copy of the decision (rejecting the appeal) & returns the records received with Lr 4.

BB
W
6/4

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

20249





Presented by Mr. K. Rajasekhara, clerk of Mr. K. N. Krishnaswamy Advocate for the appellant.
3.12.28

4

838

Muzrai 205-28-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA

OF MYSORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1925-26.

Appellant:- Patel Venkatay Gowda, son of Thimme Gowda of Reddinalli, Devanahalli Taluk.

The Appellant above-named most respectfully begs to state as follows:-

1. That in Reddinalli village in Chennarayapatna Hobli, Devanahalli Taluk, there was from time immemorial a small Muzrai Temple of Sri Thirumaladevaru enjoying an inam of about two acres of land which has been in the possession and enjoyment of its pujari.

2. That about the year 1878 the Appellant's father Thimme Gowda and grand-father Appe Gowda intended to construct a temple in the village to install their family Gods - Sri Venkteswara Swami and Sree Devi and Bhoodevi and endow the temple suitably for perpetual worship and were collecting materials for constructing the said temple.

3. That about that time the Poziar Temple of Thirumaladevaru was in a neglected state and even the temple building was in a dilapitated - condition. The Taluk authorities at this stage intervened and persuaded the Appellant's father and grand-father to abandon the idea of construct ing a new temple and influenced them to enlarge and rebuild the old and dilapitated temple of -- Sri Thirumaladevaru with the permission that the Appellant's father and grand-father might have - the privilege of installing their own family Gods in the said temple and arrange for the endowment worship of the said Gods in any manner they -- thought fit. The Government also encouraged the Appellant's father to spend large sums of money on this enterprise promising in consideration -- therefor full and ample privileges to the Appellar and his family to arrange for the usual worship - of Sri Thirumaladevaru which had then been in a - neglected state.

4. Thus encouraged by Government and believing in their good faith, the Appellant's -- father and grand-father spent several thousands of rupees in rebuilding the temple and in erecting a Garudagambha and in endowing it with vessels jewels, Uthsavamurthies and all other things -- necessary, including an oil Mill to supply oil - for deeparadhana.

5. That ever since that date the Appellant father and after him the Appellant have been -- regularly meeting the expenses of the puja of both

the

the deities out of their family funds, while the pujari has been in undisturbed possession and enjoyment of the inam lands. The Appellant and his father and grand-father before him have been taking interest in this temple because of the fact that their family God Sri Venkateswara Swami has been installed therein and because the Government at the outset gave a distinct promise that in consideration of the great sums that the Appellant's family spent -- for rebuilding and endowing the temple the -- management would always vest in them in perpetuity.

6. That all along the worship was being conducted once a week. But in the year 1927 the Appellant with a view to perpetuate daily worship of the Gods and to meet the extra expense and to provide for a suitable living for the Archik -- applied for the grant of 20 acres out of Gomal Re-Survey No.50 of Reddihalli village. The Government after being satisfied about the necessity -- for the grant and being convinced of the charitable object of the Appellant who being childless wanted to perpetuate the devine service which had been started by their ancestors, sanctioned 10 acres out of the said survey number for an upset price - and issued a saguvali chit on 9-7-1927.

7. That subsequently the party in the -- village which is opposed to the Appellant imputed - selfish motives to the Appellant and on 13-8-1927 submitted a protest petition to the authorities not only against the grant of these 10 acres of land - but also against the control and management of the

temple

temple affairs by the Appellant and prayed that they may be entrusted to a few Dharmadarsis. - Upon this the Learned Deputy Commissioner in his order dated 25-10-27 though he confirmed the -- grant of 10 acres of landto the temple, virtually cancelled the grant ~~a~~ in favour of the Appellant by directing its 5 years produce to be sold and thus removed the management from the Appellant's family and entrusted the same to the hands of a few Dharmadarsis. In appeal No.30 of 1927-28 -- though the Learned Muzrai Commissioner felt convinced that the sale of 5 years produce did not - result in any larger income to the temple than -- about Rs.2-8-0 per year, still was not pleased to disturb the order regarding the appointment of -- Dharmadarsis and justified the same on grounds which have never existed . This appeal is preferred -- against the said order of the Learned Muzrai Commissioner on the following grounds among others:-

(1) All the Lower Courts have failed to see that the order in appeal is directly opposed to the letter and spirit of the promise which the Government made while they induced the Appellant's father and grand-father to invest nearly Rs.10,000/- for rebuilding and improving the temple and in endowing - it.

(2) Whatever jurisdiction the Government may have as regards the arrangement in respect of the -- performance of puja of Sri Thirumaladevaru, the -- Government have no jurisdiction to control and -- interfere in the worship of the Appellant's family Gods Sri Venkateswara and Sri Devi and Bhudevi for whose worship and endowment the Appellant has a --

free

free hand.

(3) The Government throughout their enquiry have lost sight of the fact that in persuading the Appellant's father and grandfather to abandon the idea of constructing a a separate temple to install their family -- Gods, and in inducing them to install the said Gods also in the Muzrai Temple, and in giving a freehand in the construction and endowment of the temple the Government have given a tacit - agreement not to interfere with the freedom of management and ~~xx~~ worship of their family Gods which the Appellants have enjoyed since 1879.

(4) Specially in the absence of any abuse of his powers or of any neglect of duty by the - Appellant the attitude taken by the Lower Courts is prejudicial to the Appellant's interests.

(5) At any rate whatever arrangements the Government may choose to make regarding the --- affairs of Sri Thirumaladevaru by the appointment of Dharmadarsis, the Government cannot exercise - any jurisdiction regarding the affairs and worship of the Appellant's family Gods which at the request of the Government have been installed in the same temple, but for which the Government have not been giving a pie out of the Muzrai funds.

(6) The Appellant and his family have been able and willing to perpetuate the worship of their family Gods suitably without the intervention of -- Dharmadarsis.

(7) In case the Government are pleased to - revise the order of the Lower Courts and remove the Dharmadarsis, the Appellant is also ready and will-

ing

willing to perpetuate the daily worship of Sri Thirumaladevaru also as usual.

(8) The order of the Lower Courts are inequitable and unjust.

Wherefore the Appellant most respectfully prays that the Government be pleased to call for the records and also to inspect the documents in the custody of the Appellant, and be pleased, -- either to vacate the orders of the Lower Courts, and vest the entire management and control of the temple and worship of all the deities in the -- hands of the Appellant as usual on such terms and conditions which the Government might deem fit -- and proper or in case the Government are not prepared to entrust the management of the worship of Sri Thirumaladevaru to the Appellant, the Government be pleased to separate the same from the -- worship and service of the Appellant's family Gods Sri Venkteswara and Sri Devi and Bhudevi, and the management and control of the affairs and worship of the said Gods be restored to the Appellant and that the 20 acres of land now prayed for be granted for the Appellant to meet the daily worship of his family Gods and also be pleased to grant a -- suitable vacant site to enable the Appellant to - put up a house for the pujari.

The Appellant further prays that considering that the Lower Courts in their enquiry have -- lost sight of the Appellant's rights regarding his family Gods and the orders are passed on the --- assumption that they related only to Sri Thirumala-Devaru, a stay order might kindly be issued directing

that

that the orders of the Lower Courts be held in abeyance pending the disposal of this appeal before the Government.

BANGALORE
3rd Decr. 1928.



Order of the Madras Commissioner in Mysore

Subject:- Appeal (petition No 30 of 27-28) of Patel Venkatagowda of Reddihalli village Devanahalli Taluk against the order of the Commissioner Bangalore District, directing the lease for 5 years of ten acres of land granted to the temple of Dramila devaru in the village and the appointment of Dharmadarsis for the same.

Appellant. Patel Venkatagowda of Reddihalli village Devanahalli Taluk.

Respondent:- Nanjundappa Son of Kuri Thimmi residing in the same village.

Facts of the case

On the application of the appellant. the Deputy Commissioner granted to the above temple an extent of 10 acres of formal land for an upset price of 1 rupee per acre and the appellant was thereafter asked by the Amildar to give a Muchalika in respect of the land granted. On 27-6-27 he executed a Muchalika stating that he had his

heirs would keep the land in their possession and pay the annual Kandayam to be fixed hereafter bearing the cost of improvement of the land giving the temple the Rajapat or anything that may be fixed by Govt failing which he may be deprived of the possession of the land. Subsequently on 4-7-27 he gave a statement before the Amildar that he would have the Rajapat estimated by the panchayatdars and credit the cost thereof to the Savings Bank in the name in favour of the temple. The Sapavali chit was given to Venkatesprada on 13-7-27 and the Kandayam on the land was fixed at Rs 22-8-0 on 13-8-27 the villagers petitioned both the Amildar and the Sub Div officer accusing Venkatesprada of misappropriation of the income from a stone oil mill belonging to the temple and of having obtained 10 acres of Govt land in the name of the temple, but for his own benefit to the detriment of the interests of the villagers. They urged the appointment of Dharmadarsis for the Institution The Sub Division Officer in calling for a report directed that till he saw the land the patel should not put in possession of the land. He was informed of this on 20-8-27. On 27-9-27, the Sub Division Officer sent up the records to the Deputy Commissioner stating that the temple.

was well maintained having been built by the appellant and his father with the contribution of the villagers as well, that the request of the villagers for the appointment of a set of Dharmadarsis was reasonable and that the land given to the temple may in view of the opposition of the villagers be leased out for a period of 5 years and a scale fixed on the income derived. The Deputy Commissioner approved the Sub Divisin Officer's proposal but the observation that the appellant himself may purchase the lease and the amount realised may be given to the Dharmadarsis for payment. The order of the Deputy Commissioner was that the lease was purchased in auction by the respondent for an annual sum of Rs 25/- out of which the Dharmadarsis of the land (Rs 22-8-0) had to be paid leaving only Rs 2-8-0 for the temple. The sale was confirmed by the Sub Divisin Officer on 30-3-28. Two Dharmadarsis were appointed by the Deputy Commissioner on 27-3-28. The appellant has come up in appeal against the Deputy Commissioner's order. The appellant's re- presented by his counsel was heard.

Order No. 27-Dis 71 of 28-29 dated 9-10-28

It is not clear what objection the appellant can have to the appointment of Dharmadarsis

and Satisfactory arrangements being made for the management of the Temple if his object is merely to see that the temple is properly maintained. Even if the fact that the temple was built by his ancestors is true, we cannot entrust such a right permanently, the more so as he has obtained the grant of a land for the temple. It is nothing uncommon for persons to make use of a religious institution as a cloak for some personal objects. It is true that the lease has not fetched a Satisfactory rental, but this can be rectified by giving the land for a longer period when the term of present lease terminates. On the whole I am Satisfied that the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner are in the best interests of the institution

The appeal is rejected.

Sd) P.S. Dikshitar.
Judicial Commissioner

Copy applied for 30.10.28
Copy ready 3 11 28
Copy delivered 7 11 28
No of words 718
Copying charges 1-4-3
Comparing " 3
Compared by Hanumanthaiah.

"Copy"

N. Bheemasingh
For Jud. Comr

COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE
NOV 7 1928

K. N. SRINIVASAN, M. A., LL. B.
AND
R. SHESHADRI, B. A., LL. B.,
ADVOCATES,



Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

~~In the Chief Court of Mysore~~, Bangalore

Misc. Appeal **No.** of 1928 - 1929.

Appellants Petitioners.		*Respondents Opponents.*
Patel Venkate Gowda	**Vs.**	

1. I the Appellant above named do, by these presents, retain Messrs. **K. N. Srinivasan, M. A., LL. B., & R. Sheshadri, B. A., LL. B., Advocates,** to appear and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower them to do all necessary acts in the above case, to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf, and to receive from the Court all documents, refunds and all sums of money that I may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the acts done by the said Advocates or by any other Advocate on their behalf in so doing.

3/12 1928
BANGALORE.

Personally known to me and signed in my presence.—ACCEPTED.

K N Srinivasan

Advocates for Appellant

Advocates for Appellant

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Inspector General of Irrigation

Date of issue 14/12/28

Signed by: K. Somasundaram

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith Petition no 831 Dy 3rd Dec. 928 from Patel Venkatayya Patel of Reddikalli, Devanahally Taluk appealing against your order confirming the Collector's decision attaching Dharmadarsi and making other ~~[illegible]~~ ~~fixing~~ arrangements

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

for the better management.
I sri Lanka should
transfer it forthwith and
to report that the same
maybe returned together
with the connected records
and a report on the subject.
The petitioner has been
informed that no stay
order can be passed
pending the disposal of
his appeal petition.

Manuscript.

10/12
Jr Secy. to Govt.
12/12
Law Dept

11.11
17/12/15

Appendix F G -1

SUBJECT . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Section Mey

File No. 2005 '28

Diary No. of letter replied to. . . . . .

Serial No. 3

No. 1158

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

To Endorsement

the *192*

Date of issue 14/12/28

Signed by Asst Sd - Somasundaram Jy/-

In reply to his ~~appeal~~ petition dated 3rd Oct. 1928 ~~attending~~ against the order of the M.C. confirming the order of the D.C. Bangalore in the matter of the management of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swamy temple at Bevihally, Devanahally Taluk, Patel Venkatappa Gowda is informed that ~~an appeal~~ the date hearing ~~collector from the M.C.~~ his appeal would be

List of enclosures. . . . . .

Copied by. . . . . .

Examined by. . . . . .

over

instructed them on receipt
of the record which Lauchheim
called for from the B.L.C. and
that no stay order as prayed
for can be granted ~~Tuesday~~
~~disposed of this afternoon.~~
By order
WD
for Secretary of War

MJC. 13]

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
11 FEB. 1929
No.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSION

Bangalore, 9th Feb. 1929.

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
6/12
MUZRAI
D1206

No. 1010 / 28-9 Ex 2 files

FROM F. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Muz 205-28-13

To P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

Referring to your letter No.1157/Muz.205-28-2 dated 14th December 1928 forwarding for report with records petition of Patel Venkatagowda of Beddihalli, Devanahalli Taluk, appellant against this office order confirming the Deputy Commissioner's decision appointing Dharmadarsis for the management of the temple of Sri Tirumaladevaru at Beddihalli, I have the honor to forward herewith the connected records received with the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.J.S-3163 of 28-29 dated 2nd February 1929.

This office file No.D1 Dis.71 of 28-29 dated 5th October 1928 containing the order appealed against the presence of [illegible] gives the facts of the case as also enclosed.

The appeal petition together with its enclosures as mentioned retransmitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

M346

D 1501

లేఖిని కొనుగు అమ్మిలలు మూడిరుపు సుంగరిగళిగే స్వామియు వరు ఐవన
ఇరుందెయుంకే ట్రిబ్యునల్ దయుహిం లసుదు ఆదేశగళన్ను సుదరిదోవస్థా
నక్కే సంబంధ పట్టు అజబాంబుగళన్ను ఇరీతి మూడిబిడు వుదుంగా
వస్థానద సుంగరిగళు నమ్మగళ రూంబురూంచోల స్వామియు వరనెన్ను
ద్రోహ నదళ్ళు లేఖిలలు మొందియు సుళిదిర్వుత్తానే

ఆద్దరింద గ్రామస్థర పర బందిద్ద సాక్షిగళు
ఈగ అంతే మూడిరోళ్ళువుదే నందరే నుదరిదోవస్థాన వన్ను
రెన్న మనే గంతలూ డి బ్యాంకి బళగే మూడిరుంత్తిరువుత్తానే గ్రామస్థ
రింద నమ్మగళిగే పూజే పునస్కార మూడిసువుదక్కే అవకాశవోల
ఇల్లా ముందే ఈ అమ్మిలలు మొందియు స్థిరాసదళ్ళియో ఈదో
వస్థానక్కే సంబంధ పట్టు అజబాంబుగళు ఇద్దళ్ళు ఎల్లరూ
విలోపొంది అతిపొ రేలతో మూడువుదక్కే ఈరసు రిజిస్ట్రేషనుయువుదిల్ల
ఆద్దరింద ఫిర్యాదుదారరు గంబర రీడుపొలో ఒకిర్వుదళ్ళరెందు
ఈబగే మొందలాగి నింద లూజ్ వరు నడేసిరువ రీతి రిలీఫ్ గళిల్లవ
క్కే వన్ను పరిగణిసి ఈరసనన్ను ఈదోవస్థానక్కే యూ వివిధయు
దళ్ళిరువూ సంబంధ పిల్లదేరి మొందలు నైజ.దండ రీతిగుదిందవేజూ
మూడిసిదోవస్థానద అజబాంబుగళన్ను ఇదక్కే సంబంధ పట్టు విల్లళ్ళరళ్ళ
పరిగణిసువస్థక్కే రోపిసిసువంతే ట్రిబ్యునల్ దయుహింలసుదువుదల్లదే ఇవనలిం
లన్ను వజాయించిసి స్వామియవర అర్జుదరనన్ను ఇండొందస్ దయుహింలసిబేకెం

గ్రామస్థర్ద సిరోళ్ళిత్తిరువ ముఖ్యస్థరు -

ఈ ఎడగ్యై డేబేట్టిన గుర్తిసరుజు [redacted] అమ్మిలు వ్యక్తియ
వరు నిజాయితిప్పరెందు తీర్పు

ఈ ఎడగ్యై డేబేట్టిన గుర్తిసరుజు దోడ్డబ్బణ్ణా రెందు తీర్పు

ఈ ఎడగ్యై డేబేట్టిన గుర్తిసరుజు హొళ్ళూరు రంపతిమ్మణ్ణారెందు తీర్పు

అదుసరకష్టిష్టలూరు లష్ట అష్టైశ్వర్యజు

R Dasappa

తేది 27-3-29

10 1503

మైసూరు సంస్థానద శ్రీమన్మహారాజరవర
కాల్ద మేంతో జనరల్ మత్తు రివిన్యూ కమిశ్రియవర
జనాంబిగె —

దేవనరుళ్గె కొట్టూరి జాన్నె రాందయు పుట్టణద మ్రాంబళి రవిద్దరుళ్గె
గ్రామద ఈ కెళగిన రంజుమహాకిరుప ర్యైతరు ప్రజెగళు బరిదు కొండ
అరుహాళు అర్జి

సుదరి రవిద్దరుళ్గె గ్రామద ల్లిరువ సుల్కాది మొదలాదవు
ఏలంబిగె సీరిద శ్రీ తిరుమల దేవరిగె ఈగ్రామద సీమెయొళ
దల్లి మ్రాంబళిగా దేవర కుసరిగె ఖాయిదె కట్టి సుదరిజ మిందినవర
రుజరక్కె బేంగళూరు దివ్రిస్ట్రిక్ట్ డిప్యుటీ కమిషనర్ సాహెబరవర
ఠరాదనంతె పుంజసాల్ గుత్తిగె కళుహిసిరువుదల్లి
ఇదే గ్రామద ల్లిరువ సుల్కాది మొదలాదవు శ్రీ తిరుమల దేవరిగె
కుసరిగె ఖాయిదె కట్టి కొట్టిరువుదన్ను

దివంగత గ్రామద పటేల్ వింతపల్లి కాడ సున్నిధానద
ని తుళింజ్ దొంతి సుదరి వలనిశా మప్పనన్ను మొఖ్యంగి శిఫారసిసిరుండు
దొంబల్
అపీలు మేరకు దిరువుహుదాంగియూ, సుదరిదేసు 10/28-29 నేల నంబళ్ళి ద్దు
ఇదే తింగళు 26 నేల తుంది బిగె విచారణెగె బందిద్దు కళుహిబళిగె
సున్నిధాన దల్లి రిందింగ్ ఇట్టిద్దు ఇరువుదాంగియూ పరిశీలనె మాడిదల్లి
ఈ విచారదల్లి గ్రామస్థరిందు సాక్ష్యగళు సున్నిధాన దల్లి తందిమాడి
రుళ్ళువుదేనందరి

సుదరి అపీలు బందిద్దు పటేల్ వింతపల్లి కాడ దొంతి
దేవరడిగె సుంకె ఖాదిగె బగె బుంజసాల్ గుత్తిగె కళుహిసిరువుదల్లి
జమీనువిచారదల్లి తిందే సుదరిజమీనన్ను మొఖ్యం సాగు
లిగె పడిదుకొళ్ళలు బేకెందు దురుద్దిన్నె పుట్టిద్దు కొండు సుదరిజమీ

P.T.O.

నిన్న దరఖాస్తు లోపల్లో లంగాలు లేరుతో వరిచిన లేన్నట్టి ప్రయోగం జనత్యా గా మోసగతియింద రిక్కొండు నడిసుత్తా అద్దానే.

2) ఈ విచారదల్లి మ్యాసూర్ సీమేయ ముజరాయి రమీషన్ సొండిరువ బరవరల్లి సుదరిపువేతో పేంతవేగొండ ప్రతిలిపిలు మాండిద్దరమేలి సుదరి సొండిరువరు ఈ బాంబరు తిక్కొండుయువ లోపరాంబరితియింద ఈ కన ప్రతిలన్ను పజాం మూడిరుత్తారి.

ఈగలూం సున్నిధాన దల్లి ఈ కనం ప్రతిలు మూడిరు వుదరింద గ్రా మస్థరిందు సాక్షిగళిల్లరూ దొంజరింగి లమ్మిష్టన సున్నిధాన గంగళల్లి ఈ విచారవాగి ప్రతిలిపిమాడిలోల్లలు అవకాశ విల్లద సుబూంబ్ నమ్మగళ్ళ వ్యైరి ప్రసుభవ మస్థరిందు మరల్పు ఈబాం బరు తిక్కొండు నడివళిగళ్ళ స్నాబల్లవరింద భరితిమ్మయ్యన ముగ మునిశామప్ప, దొండ్డప్పన్న, హొళ్ళదకంపతిమ్మన్న మునిరడ్డిప్ప లురుఫ్ ఆప్తా జప్ప, టిర్ దాసప్ప ఈనాలుజనగళ్ళన్ను స్థాపిసుగళ్ళవ రపరాంబరిదిగి లరలక్ష బగ్గె లక్షుం కొరుత్తారే.

శీఘ్ర మందరపరు లమ్మగంబళ్ళకప్పజిగళ్ళమీ లిదయు విట్టు పుచేలా వేంతవేగొండ సున్నిధాన దల్లి ప్రతిలు మూడిరు వసంగతిగళిగి సున్నిధాన దల్లి గంబళ్ళకరుగళ్ళందు నమ్మగళ్ళపరవాగి దొంజరింగిరువ ఐవరుగళ్ళంద దొంబలాంయితిగళ్ళన్నుభరింబరిసిదెన్ని ధాన దల్లి ఐవరుగళ్ళం ప్రతిలే మూడికొళ్ళువ ఐదనేయ సుంబంధపట్టవిచార గళ్ళన్ను పరిసీలనెయింద ప్యైసూర్ మాండిసి కొండుబేరొంగి ప్రొద్దిసుత్తిరువే మరొంస్థామి.

ది 25-3-21

ఈ ఎడగైయ్యడిబ్బిట్టిన గుర్తినరుజు తుతిలమ్మ లక్ష్మనమునిశామప్ప దొంతిద్ది

ఈ ఎడగైయ్యడిబ్బిట్టిన గుర్తినరుజు దొండ్డప్పన్నదొంతిద్ది

ఈ ఎడగైయ్యడిబ్బిట్టిన గుర్తినరుజు హొళ్ళదకంపతిమ్మన్నహాకితిద్దు

ఇముని రెడ్డి ప్రసాదరు వ్యవస్థాపకాధ్యక్షరు

R Dasappa

ఛైర్మన్ నరు జి

ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಬಿಳ್ಳೆಯ

ಮುಂದಲಿಂದ ಉಂಗುಷ್ಠ

ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬಿಳ್ಳೆಯ

ಮುಂಗಡೆ ಜಬ್ಬಾಗಡೆ ಬೆಂಕಿಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕಂಚಿಲಿ ಪಲು ನಿಳಾಮು ಬೆಳ

ಬೆಂಕಪಟ್ಟಿ ಮಡಿಯ

ಟಿಂದ್ರಾ ವಿಡುಬಡಿದ ಸೋಲು

ಕಂಚಿಲಿ ಬೆಂಕಪಟ್ಟಿ

ರೆಂಪರಿ ಮ್ಮಲಯ್ಯಗೆ

ಅಲಮಡ್ಡಾ

ರೆಂಪರಿ ಮ್ಮಲಡ್ಡಾ

ಕಂಚಿಲಿಚ್ಚೇರಬೆಳ

P.T.O.

నంజప్ప

తిరకప్ప పెద్ద నాగిణి

తిమ్మి విడ మునిరం

తిమ్మి విడ రంభులచ్చి -

తిమ్మి విడ మునిరాము లురుభీ మూ సింగ్ ను

తిమ్మి విడ కొండలచ్చి -

తిమ్మి విడ చిన్న -

ఈ మేల్కొండవర ఎడగ్గేడిచ్చి వ్రేసుకొన్నరు జుగళ్లు

Before the Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 10 of 1928-9

Appellant. *Vs.* Respondent

Patel Venkate Gowda
Son of Thimme Gowda
of Reddihalli, Devanahalli
Taluk.

Munisamappa and
certain other Villagers.

Subject.

Appeal against the M.'s
order confirming the D.C's
order sanctioning arrangements
for the betteer manage-
ment of Sri Tirumala
Devara temple at Reddihalli,
Devanahalli Taluk

Decision

Copy members minutes
on page 7 of the office
note. From " the case was
heard - - - - - - - - - - - -
Therefore rejected "

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

Encl. two files.

Memo 2165 / Ltr reg 205-28-3

Copy to the M.C.

Acknowledge the receipt with this letter no 1016.

dj 11 2.

13.0

11/2/74

(G)

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 10 of 1928-29.

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent
Patel Venkate Gowda son of Thimme Gowda of Reddihalli, Devanhalli Taluk.		Munisamappa and certain other villagers.

Subject.

Appeal against the Muzrai Commissioner's order confirming the Deputy Commissioner's order sanctioning arrangements for the better management of Sri Tirumala Devaru Temple at Reddihalli, Devanhalli Taluk.

Decision.

The case was heard on 26th March 1929. The appellant was present and represented by his Counsel Mr. K.N. Srinivasan; some of the -- villagers of the Reddihalli village were also present and presented a petition.

There are no reasons to interfere with the orders passed by the Muzrai Commissioner and the appeal is therefore rejected.

Memo No. 2165 Revenue Two/Misc/ Muz 205-28 & Bangalore, dated the 6th April 1929.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, returning the records received with his letter No. 1010, dated 11th February 1929.

By Order,

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

TRM.R